

CRAWFORD PLLC
Attorneys at Law
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
St. Paul, Minnesota 55120
651-686-6633 • fax 651-686-7111

FACSIMILE

DATE:	August 7, 2002	SERIAL NO.	09/437,006
TO:	Examiner C. Brown	FROM:	Robert J. Crawford
FAX NO.:	703-872-9311	DOCKET NO.	PHA 51219
PHONE NO.:	703-305-0727		

NO. OF PAGES 5
(w/ cover sheet):

DOCUMENT ATTACHED:

Office Action Response After Final

OFFICIAL
FAX RECEIVED
AUG 7 - 2002
GROUP 1700

NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND
ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED/WORK PRODUCT INFORMATION

This memorandum and the transmission it accompanies contain confidential information. The attorney-client privilege and the attorney work-product doctrines may protect this confidential information. This confidential information is to be reviewed only by the addressee identified above. If you have received this transmission in error, you are instructed to destroy all pages immediately and to call the sender at the telephone number indicated above.

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Zheng et al.	Examiner:	Brown, C.
Serial No.:	09/437,006	Group Art Unit:	1765
Filed:	November 9, 1999	New Docket No.:	PHA 51219
		(Old Docket No.):	(VI.SI.268PA)
Title:	ETCH PROCESS THAT RESISTS NOTCHING AT ELECTRODE BOTTOM		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence and the papers, as described hereinabove, are being sent via facsimile to 703-872-9311 attention Examiner Charlotte A. Brown on August 7, 2002.

By: Erin M. Nichols

Erin M. Nichols

OFFICE ACTION RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 7, 2002, please reconsider the rejection of the claims in view of following remarks.

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The Office Action mailed on June 7, 2002 again asserts that the pending claims (claims 1-21) are not patentable because the Examiner believes the invention is obvious under Section 103(a) over *Grimbergen et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,334) in view of *Witek et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,627,395). Applicant again traverses and, should the